THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 155 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · JULY 11, 1942 NUMBER 2

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 21

EDITORIALS

Odell Waller 24

Taste of Defeat *by Freda Kirchwey* 25

ARTICLES

Ships and New Fronts *by Paul Maxwell Zeis* 26

Farmers vs. the Farm Bureau *by Dale Kramer* 28

Thoughts on "World War III?" *by G. A. Borgese, Julius Deutsch, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Octavio Mangabeira* 30

Everybody's Business *by Keith Hutchison* 33

In the Wind 34

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

The Bugbear of Pragmatism *by Jacques Barzun* 35

Mr. Hoover on Peace *by Reinhold Niebuhr* 36

The Free French in Africa *by Hal Lehrman* 37

Lafayette *by W. E. Woodward* 38

Music *by B. H. Haggin* 39

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS 40

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Washington Editor I. F. STONE
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART

Assistant Editor RICHARD H. ROVERE
Music Critic B. H. HAGGIN
Drama Critic JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Board of Contributing Editors
NORMAN ANGELL • JONATHAN DANIELS • LOUIS FISCHER
REINHOLD NIEBUHR • J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Business Manager HUGO VAN ARX
Advertising Manager MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Published weekly and copyright, 1942, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 856 National Press Building.

The Shape of Things

CONGRESSMEN OF ALL PARTIES APPEAR TO be worried about their political fates in the coming elections, and their nervousness is manifesting itself in strange ways. It has led some of them, for instance, to challenge the right of citizens to examine and comment on the speaking and voting records of their representatives. More normal are the attempts to sidetrack supposedly unpopular issues, the efforts to propitiate organized groups, and the heightened interest in patronage. We should like to suggest that, far from smoothing its path to reelection, Congress as a whole is encouraging a movement "to turn the rascals out" which will result in sweeping changes on Capitol Hill. The temper of the electorate is absolutely against politics as usual. People are not interested in being let down gently in the matter of war sacrifices if as a result the war effort is hampered. They would like to have from their Congressmen more courageous leadership and less querulous straddling. They are not likely to overlook such matters as the Congressional record on inflation control, which has combined timidity and delay with downright obstruction. Price control was postponed for many months and when finally authorized was left with a yawning gap owing to Congressional subservience to the farm bloc. Now an attempt is being made to hamstring the Office of Price Administration by cutting down its appropriation from the $161,000,000 requested by the Bureau of the Budget to $75,000,000. If the Senate confirms this action by the House, Leon Henderson will be left to fight inflation with one arm tied behind him. It will be impossible to police effectively the price-ceiling orders, and the majority of defense districts are likely to be deprived of rent protection. Congress should understand that any upward revision in the cost of living will sit very badly with the voters.

*

ANOTHER ACTION BY THE HOUSE CALLING for a lot of explanation is its blocking of the Department of Agriculture appropriation as amended by the Senate. Two points are at issue: the authorization of the sale of government-held farm commodities at below parity prices, and the appropriation of $222,800,000 for the Farm Security Administration. Faced by a surplus of

LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

DIGITIZED BY ARCHIVE.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wheat beyond all possible needs, the government wants to sell part of its stocks for feed at prices which will encourage the production of more meat and eggs. Both of these are commodities the demand for which threatens to outrun supplies. Many farmers and farm organizations support this move, but it is strenuously opposed by the Farm Bureau, which, representing mainly the large farmers, is determined to maintain the parity principle at all costs. This organization has also lobbied constantly against the Farm Security Administration, for reasons discussed by Dale Kramer in an article on page 28. The House has followed the Farm Bureau line, while the Senate has supported the Administration, although its amendment failed to restore to the bill the full appropriation asked for the FSA. Now there is a deadlock which has left the Department of Agriculture without funds to operate in the year which started on July 1. Replying to a letter signed by leaders of seven farm, labor, and religious organizations on July 3, the President strongly condemned the "pressure-group tactics" blocking the sale of government surplus grain and indorsed the Senate's proposals for the FSA appropriation as important to the war program.

*

THE STRANGE, UNHAPPY POLICY OF THE United States toward our fighting allies, the Free French, is symbolized in the observance of Free French week, which begins this Wednesday. This is a popular celebration—as it should be. The people of the United States have a keen emotional regard for the courage and devotion to freedom which have led Frenchmen to leave their country and fight on every sea and continent for its liberation from the tyranny of Hitler. But Free French week will go unnoticed by our government. The celebration will open with an exchange of greetings between Wendell Willkie, speaking in New York, and General Charles de Gaulle in London. While our President keeps a discreet silence—the silence of appeasement—the honors are done by Mr. Willkie, who has somehow managed to become a sort of unofficial President who can do the things and say the things that Mr. Roosevelt would like to do and say but dare not. Though we admire his stand, we begrudge Mr. Willkie the role of spokesman for freedom; it should belong to the man we elected President.

*

OUR NAVAL FORCES IN THE NORTHWESTERN Pacific celebrated July 4 by successful submarine attacks against Japanese destroyers, three of which were sunk while a fourth was left burning. These vessels were discovered in the westernmost Aleutians, where at least three islands have been occupied by Japanese forces of unknown strength. Added to previous losses inflicted by our airmen, the sinking of these warships makes the total bill paid by the enemy for his excursion into Alaskan waters a fairly heavy one. Nevertheless, behind a curtain of fog which seldom lifts sufficiently for our air reconnaissance to observe their activities, the Japanese appear to be extending their hold in this desolate but strategically important region. Whether they are planning to pursue their island-creeping technique with a view to an eventual attack on Dutch Harbor and the Alaskan mainland, or whether their primary purpose is to establish bases for interrupting communications between the United States and the Russian Far Eastern provinces, it is impossible to say. But in either event Japanese occupation of the outer Aleutians is a menace which ought to be ended at the earliest possible moment. Air attacks, limited as they are by adverse weather conditions, are unlikely to be sufficient to accomplish the job, but this was the only form of activity reported by the army and navy until the Independence Day submarine foray. Consequently, there has been a tendency in some quarters to suggest that our service chiefs were not taking the Aleutian invasion seriously enough. We find this difficult to believe, but we hope that plans for expelling the Japanese will not prove long in maturing.

*

BY THE TIME THIS ISSUE OF *THE NATION* appears, a New York draft board will have decided whether Ralph Ingersoll, editor of *PM,* is of more value to the country than Private Ingersoll of the United States army. When the board decided in the first instance that he belonged in the armed forces, Mr. Ingersoll—who volunteered in the last war a year before he was subject to the draft—quietly reported for induction, declined to appeal, and asked his employer, Marshall Field, not to appeal on his behalf. Despite this request, and we believe with good reason, Mr. Field did appeal, contending that the editor was waging an important battle on the home front—a fight for better morale, a fight against disrupters, intellectual saboteurs, and other war-time luxuries. But this kind of warfare breeds bitter enemies, and the appeal in Ingersoll's behalf has given his favorite targets an opportunity they could not fail to snatch. "He allows his country's call to go unanswered," says McCormick's Chicago *Tribune,* which has now to compete with Field's Chicago *Sun.* "Dodging the draft," says Cissie Patterson's inflammatory Washington *Times-Herald.* "So far as I know," says the brave Representative Rankin, hiding under the cover of Congressional immunity, "he is as patriotic as any man who ever dodged the draft—by proxy." And Coughlinite defenders of fascism, with fine irony, picket his offices. Do these mean-spirited little people demand that Ingersoll be drafted because they think he would make a great soldier, do they consider service in the United States army a punishment, or do they just want to get rid of a man who knows them for what they are and has had the courage to expose them?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HITLER BOASTED IN "MEIN KAMPF" THAT it would be a "simple matter" for him to produce unrest in the United States. "We shall soon have storm troopers in America . . . we shall have men whom degenerate Yankeedom will not be able to challenge." Yet in the six months that the Third Reich and "degenerate Yankeedom" have been at war Hitler and his agents have not accomplished a single large-scale act of sabotage against the American production that means their ruin; and when, for lack of inside talent, they were reduced to the desperate device of landing two contingents of Nazi wreckers with their supplies on the beaches of Long Island and Florida, these supermen were challenged so quickly that they had hardly had time to fill up on good American food before they were arrested and headed toward trial and swift judgment. As Francis Biddle pointed out the other day in his report on the campaign against sabotage, espionage, and sedition, we should not derive a false sense of security from the cheerful record of the first six months; but we can't help crowing a bit over the fact that the Nazis have had about as much success here as they had in Russia in recruiting a native fifth column of saboteurs; otherwise they would not be forced to attempt fantastic landings on our coasts.

*

IN GENERAL THE LAST FORTNIGHT HAS been unhealthy for German agents in this hemisphere. Max Stephan, German-born, was convicted of treason in Detroit for assisting a Nazi prisoner of war, Hans Peter Krug, who had escaped from Canada and had been lavishly befriended by Stephan. Gerhard Wilhelm Kunze, Bund leader, who is wanted in Connecticut on charges of espionage, was arrested in Mexico after he had failed in an attempt to escape in a fishing boat. He has already been sent back to Hartford. And from the Canal Zone comes news of the arrest of twenty persons whose subversive activities included the supplying of fuel and information to Nazi submarines operating in the Caribbean. They are no doubt directly connected with many of the sinkings of the past weeks. The central figure in this story, which is, as usual, more sensational than fiction, is a business man of British Honduras who was also trying to escape by sea, presumably to board a Nazi submarine, when navy patrol planes captured his boat.

*

BOTH THE INDIAN NATIONALISTS AND THE British government appear to be feeling their way toward a reduction in the gap that separates them, and as a result there has been some easing of political tension in India. A reorganization of the Viceroy's council has made possible increased Indian participation in the government on the lines proposed during the abortive Cripps mission. Sir Firoz Noon Khan, a moderate Moslem, has been appointed Minister of Defense, and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar has been named Minister of Labor, thus giving the 60,000,000 "untouchables" of whom the latter is the leader a representative on the council for the first time. With the enlargement of the council non-official Indian members enjoy a clear majority. At the same time two Indians have been appointed to sit with the War Cabinet in London; this puts India in the same position on that body as the Dominions. While Britain has been making these concessions, Gandhi, in his usual frank way, has announced a change of views. He now believes that "foreign troops are necessary for a defense of India" and is therefore prepared to welcome the Anglo-American forces provided they leave as soon as the crisis is over. However, the Mahatma's statements are always subject to interpretation, and the gloss he himself offers on this occasion leaves much unclear. For instance, he thinks that the military forces protecting India should not exercise any authority over the people of India—a proposition which, to put it mildly, seems to offer insuperable administrative difficulties. Nor will practical Western minds be attracted by the suggestion that India express its philosophy of non-violence by sending ambassadors to Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo, "not to beg peace but to show them [the Axis powers] the futility of war."

*

FRANCO'S ORDER PUTTING GENERAL QUEIPO de Llano under "forced residence" in Malaga could be dismissed as one more incident in the latent struggle between the army and the Phalanx if the past behavior of the General did not contribute a special flavor to this latest clash. As an officer Queipo's record in the Spanish war was neither better nor worse than Franco's, though he could at least boast of having won Seville and Cadiz at the very beginning and so of rendering a great service to the rebellion. But he injured his considerable military prestige by his ungoverned passion for oratory. Every night in broadcasts to Spain and Latin America he expounded his remarkable views on the war and the world at large—views which, it was generally believed, found their source in the excellent sherry of which Queipo was a connoisseur. Nevertheless, he held his high post of military boss of southern Spain until the end of the war. The peace did not agree with him. He was the first officer of his rank to take an open stand against the hegemony of the Phalanx, and Franco, in order to get rid of him, sent him to Italy on a special military mission. But on his return to Spain he came into constant friction with the group around Serrano Suñer, and his nationalist feeling hardened against the increasing, humiliating submission to Hitler's half-visible army of occupation. If he really went so far as to take part in an embryonic conspiracy, it would not be for the first time. He revolted against the monarchy at the end of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera; he revolted against the republic with Franco. Each time he revolted on the winning side; but for all that, his latest rebellion could easily be exaggerated, and we hope the State Department and the British Foreign Office will not be carried away by the illusion that they have at last found their Man.

*

ABOUT 40 PER CENT OF THIS COUNTRY'S garment industry is located in New York City, not more than 5 per cent in the South. Yet when the War Production Board allocated contracts for army uniforms, the South got more than 40 per cent of the work and New York got less than 5. The explanation lies in the supposed saving on labor costs, the result of lower Southern wages, but in its zeal for economy the WPB has managed to upset the labor situation in both places. Lack of army contracts and war-time restrictions on civilian production have already cost 84,000 New York workers their jobs; the unions estimate that between 100,000 and 150,000 more will soon be unemployed. While the New York workers are idle, the Southern employers face a labor shortage. They must hire workers off the farms, where they are desperately needed, and spend valuable time teaching them the trade. While the New York shops are idle, the Southern operators, some of whom did not even have factories when they accepted contracts, are diverting critical materials from war production to build plants and machinery. Senseless and wasteful as all this is now, it is likely to have even worse consequences after the war, for both the plant capacity and the labor supply of the garment industry will far exceed the probable demand. The leaders of the needle-trade unions deserve a hearing on their request for an immediate reallocation of contracts.

Odell Waller

TO MANY persons Odell Waller was just a man who had committed murder under somewhat extenuating circumstances. For such persons Waller's death, as the New York *Times* suggests, marks the "end of a chapter." A crime was committed and the appropriate penalty was exacted. But for thousands of other persons Odell Waller was a symbol of the faults which lie deeply imbedded in American democracy. The fact that Waller was both poor and a Negro made his case symbolic of the struggle of the under-dog in our society and—more especially—of racial discrimination. For this group his death does not mark the end of a chapter. Instead, it obstructs the solution of some of our most grievous social problems. It causes division in our ranks at a moment when unity is essential.

When, as a result of technicalities, all legal recourse was blocked, we hoped to see the sentence against Waller commuted on purely humanitarian grounds, and we think Governor Darden made a grave mistake in sending him to his death. There was at least some reason to believe that the share-cropper killed his landlord in self-defense, and there was even better reason to question the fairness of the trial. He was convicted by a jury made up, in accordance with Virginia practice, only of poll-tax payers; as a consequence Negroes and share-croppers were automatically—though not legally—excluded, and it had been argued that Waller was therefore judged not by a jury of his peers but by men drawn from a higher economic level. As a matter of fact, all but two members of the jury were landowning farmers like the man he killed. Although the Supreme Court had refused, on purely technical grounds, to review the case, it was widely felt, especially among Negroes, that the Waller conviction was a bad case of class justice. This feeling linked the trial to the disturbing problem of the morale of America's 13,000,000 Negro citizens.

Negroes have heard the President define our war aim as freedom and democracy for all without regard to race, color, or creed. They have heard, within the past fortnight, an appeal for loyalty from Federal Security Administrator McNutt. Yet almost every day they read in their papers of some new indignity imposed on a member of their race by white men. Negro soldiers are beaten up in the South because they happen to offend some white person. Despite the President's Fair Employment Order, Negroes are barred from decent jobs not only in the war industries but in the government itself. They are barred from restaurants, hotels, and the better residential sections of most cities. In some instances, as in the case of the Red Cross blood bank, offense seems deliberately intended. And even where the bars are beginning to be let down, as in the navy, Negroes are often warned that the change is a result of war-time necessity and is not permanent.

With Japan making a bold bid for the solidarity of the colored races against "white imperialism," one would think that as a matter of essential strategy, if for no better reason, official Washington would be making every effort to strengthen Negro morale. McNutt's speech for the Negro Labor Victory Committee in Harlem indicates that at least some officials are deeply concerned over the situation. But the time has passed when Negroes are likely to be impressed by speeches or promises. They see that the government still discriminates against them in federal jobs, in the army, the navy, and the Marine Corps. And they attach great importance to cases like that of Waller.

As McNutt pointed out in his Harlem speech, we are today fighting two wars—one abroad, the other at home. When Odell Waller died we lost a battle on the home front.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Taste of Defeat

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

IN WASHINGTON last week the atmosphere was tense—as it must have been in every capital from Moscow to Cairo. One American official expressed a bitterness that sounded like defeatism in commenting on the lack of capacity in the Allied war councils. He even mentioned the Waller case as one count in his indictment. But most of the people I talked to were grim rather than discouraged. They seemed to believe that the taste of defeat would rouse democratic energies and create more rather than less fighting spirit. American officials seemed calmer than the two or three Europeans I ran into. These latter live with the sense of Nazi power always in their minds. They read into the news from Egypt and London and Moscow the defeats their countries have suffered, the fatal weaknesses their governments—even they themselves—revealed in hours of decision. Americans are calm not only out of innocence. Their self-confidence has behind it power and the sense of power. But it may lack realism.

One European diplomat said of both the British and the Americans: "They seem to treat each defeat as if it were a single episode. It is explained or deplored and then dismissed as something past that mustn't happen again. They don't see these things as part of a sequence —a mounting accumulation—new ground lost to an enemy that so far has held all but a few miles of the thousands conquered. They don't seem to sense the cumulative effect of the whole series of defeats on those still fighting, on the conquered who must revolt, on the neutrals who must side with us."

Everyone seemed to assume a Western European front was necessary but would be delayed by the struggle in Egypt. One or two Americans spoke of a second front as if the announced decision to open it was in itself an accomplishment—something done. One diplomat from a conquered country expressed the utmost skepticism about it. He said Russia was facing the greatest danger it had yet encountered and could only be saved by a powerful diversion in the West. In place of that he expected talk, promises—and delay.

Much of the talk centered on Churchill's visit and his speech, then in progress, before the House of Commons. It was assumed by everyone I met that the Prime Minister would survive the test but would be weakened by it. "What can they do? There's nobody to replace him," was a frequent comment. Neither Cripps nor Eden seemed to be a possible successor to Churchill. Eden's unbroken record of weakness in time of crisis is held against him, despite his recent success in negotiating the agreement with Russia; Cripps is looked upon as able, stubborn, of fine moral fiber, but weak in Parliament and incapable of winning the confidence of the military.

There was some talk—but vague—of the need for a united high command, some suggestion that it should be headed by an American. What had we done to merit such responsibility and power? Nobody knew. Our virtue seemed to be that we had been less badly defeated than our allies and that the greatest potential strength lay in America. It was generally admitted that both China and Russia had been subordinated—for no conceivable reason apart from pride or prejudice—in the Allied councils. And it was agreed that this is bad strategy.

So much for Washington. I pass on these comments only because they indicate the state of mind I sensed in one of the blackest weeks since 1939—though no one even suggested the possibility of ultimate defeat.

Since my return, the situation has improved in Egypt and worsened in Russia. Sevastopol was counted lost last week. Today that heroic defeat has taken its place in the spreading eastward drive of the Nazi armies. There will be no Tobruks along the way, but the Red Army is yielding ground and German wedges have been driven through its lines to the Don River and the crucial railway connecting Moscow and Rostov. Resistance continues to be terrific. But as this page is being written it is clear that the great German offensive is at last under way. Whether the Russians single-handed can stop the Nazi machine is a question that hangs like a cloud over the Allied councils. Whatever may ultimately be done about a second front, the bitter fact is that no diversion is in sight at this hour when it is so desperately needed.

Meanwhile, the pressure in Egypt has been relieved, at least for the moment. The British counter-attack may have broken the momentum of Rommel's drive. But it is too early to feel confident. Auchinleck has drawn reinforcements into Egypt from Syria and other Middle Eastern countries, weakening defenses already hardly adequate. Meanwhile the Germans are said to be moving mechanized troops through the Balkans into Greece. Whether these forces will be sent to bolster Rommel's position or are being assembled in preparation for a drive through Syria to Irak and Iran is still uncertain. A serious weakening of Allied defenses in those countries might easily provoke an attack.

Whatever may be the outcome of the momentous battles now under way in Russia and in the eastern Mediterranean, one thing is certain: a single, comprehensive pattern of conquest is taking shape in which the Axis forces are combining to put pressure on all fronts at once and prevent the beleaguered armies of the United Nations from gaining the offensive anywhere. At some point—in Russia, in Egypt, in the West—that pattern must be smashed. Somewhere the Allies must seize the initiative. Until that happens we cannot expect any relief from the bad news that crowds our newspapers.

LIBRARY
[illegible] COLLEGE
[illegible] TENNESSEE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ships and New Fronts

BY PAUL MAXWELL ZEIS

THREE hundred ships torpedoed close to our shores have made America acutely aware of the shipping crisis. The great tanker traffic to our Eastern ports has virtually ceased; imports of coffee, bananas, cocoa, and other products have been sharply curtailed; supplies for our allies have begun to pile up on the docks awaiting shipment. The output of our yards has increased rapidly, but we are still losing ships more rapidly than we are building them. The amount of merchant shipping at the disposal of the United Nations today is little if any larger than the 45,000,000 dead-weight tons controlled by the Allies in 1918. This tonnage scarcely met our needs in what was primarily a North Atlantic war. Now we need fleets of merchant vessels in every ocean. Yet even if we withdrew virtually every ship from the Pacific and Indian oceans, we should hardly have enough for effective prosecution of the war in Europe.

During the summer of 1918, with shipping being utilized at its maximum efficiency, about 18,000,000 dead-weight tons were used to supply the Allies with essential imports. Britain alone required a minimum of 9,000,000 tons. Essential service for the coasting trade, the colonies, and neutrals required another 10,000,000 tons. About one-fifth of all Allied ships were assigned to military or naval service. Some of these vessels served as naval auxiliaries; others were engaged in transporting and supplying the armies in the field. Most of the remaining tonnage was undergoing repairs made necessary by enemy attack or obsolescence. Under the rigid rationing system prescribed, British imports fell 50 per cent below pre-war amounts.

Britain's shipping requirements in this war are certainly far greater than in 1918. It imports as much food now and considerably more raw materials. Its industrial plant today is larger and is more completely engaged in the production of war supplies. One factor increasing Britain's need for ships has been the enormous expansion in the use of petroleum and its products. Britain has no oil and must import enough to satisfy the tremendous demands of its navy, much of its merchant shipping, and a considerable portion of its industrial plant. The use of gasoline for planes, tanks, and other military equipment is many times that of 1918. Whereas Britain's bare import requirements totaled 35,000,000 tons during the last war, its minimum annual requirements today must be at least 45,000,000 and possibly 50,000,000 tons.

Not only does a vastly increased amount of goods have to be transported, but port facilities today are strained in a manner undreamed of twenty-five years ago. The danger of enemy air attack has destroyed much of the usefulness of England's Channel ports and impaired the effectiveness of those on the North Sea. The remaining ports can operate only during daylight. The cumulative effect of these difficulties is to diminish the number of voyages which each vessel can make.

Even more significant is the elimination of short-haul voyages, the necessity of bringing all supplies from countries several thousand miles away. In normal times Britain received nearly one-third of its imports from Europe, and this was largely true even in 1918. The Nazi conquest of the Continent has of course eliminated all possibility of obtaining food, lumber, ore, or other products from sources close at hand. Finally, the virtual severing of Britain's life line through the Mediterranean has required the rerouting of all shipping from India and the East around the Cape of Good Hope, and reduced by at least one-third the effective carrying capacity of this shipping. In these circumstances the minimum tonnage necessary to satisfy Britain's requirements is probably nearly 15,000,000 dead-weight tons.

The submarine is perhaps even more effective in this war than it was twenty-five years ago. The Germans now have free use of French ports, while the Allies are denied access to the southern Irish bases which were so valuable in anti-submarine work during the last war. It is no longer possible as in 1918 to establish a semi-blockade of the enemy's submarines by laying mine fields across the English Channel and the North Sea. Improvements in design have enabled submarines to operate with success even on this side of the Atlantic, and heavy Allied naval requirements in the Mediterranean and the Pacific have reduced materially the number of anti-submarine craft available in the North Atlantic and along our own coasts. While we shall probably be able to prevent losses at the catastrophic rate of 1917, it is unlikely that with the naval units available we shall be able to reduce sinkings much below the 250,000 gross tons a month incurred during most of 1918. Since Dunkirk there have been relatively few months when shipping losses dropped much below this figure. Many factors not now foreseen may effect a change in the rate, but on the basis of what has happened it would be unwise to expect British and Canadian shipyards to do more than replace the ships that are sunk in the Atlantic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Net additions to the Allied fleet and replacements for Pacific sinkings must come from American production.

As new shipping becomes available, some of it will surely be earmarked for supplying the Soviet Union. A glance at the map reveals the tremendous difficulties involved. The shortest route from New York to the Arctic ports is approximately 5,000 miles, through waters which may be impassable for much of the year. The long route around Africa is nearly 15,000 miles. Ships on this route cannot hope to complete more than three voyages a year. A third route across the Pacific to Vladivostok has been closed by Japan's entry into the war. To send two ships a day to Russia, certainly not a vast amount of help, will require the continuous service of at least 200 ships.

If the war is to be won, it seems certain that a second front must be established in Western Europe to take the pressure off the Russians in the east. The assembling of an American expeditionary force in Britain clearly foreshadows an invasion of the Continent. The establishment and maintenance of this front will require a vast amount of shipping, an amount for which no reliable measure is furnished by the shipping requirements of the French, American, and British forces in the last war. The troops at the front then were supported by French factories and farms, but now they will have to obtain the bulk of their supplies from overseas. In 1918 shipping experts estimated that between 7,000,000 and 10,000,000 tons of shipping would be necessary to transport and maintain an American army of 2,000,000 men in France without aid from that country. In this era of mechanized warfare the estimate would have to be raised.

The problem is further complicated by the destitution of the conquered peoples. The Nazis have already drained away from Western Europe nearly all the reserves of food, clothing, and materials. If they are driven from France, or Norway, or Italy, they will certainly destroy everything of value before they leave. The invading Allies will face the immediate problem of supplying the minimum requirements of food, clothing, and fuel for millions of people. How much tonnage might be needed for this purpose is a matter of conjecture, but certainly the establishment of a second front in Western Europe will ultimately require millions of tons of shipping in excess of that which entered the ports of continental Europe during the last war.

Moreover, in at least two other regions of the world—the Middle East and the Orient—great Allied armies must be maintained or established. In both areas the paucity of industrial plants in the immediate vicinity makes it necessary for the vast bulk of military supplies to come by sea over routes many thousands of miles long. Under strong protection the British have been able to get a few convoys through the Mediterranean, but losses both to shipping and to the naval escort vessels have been severe. Even the ships circumnavigating Africa have risked destruction by German submarines operating presumably from some point on the west coast of Africa, and this route has become far more perilous now that Japanese surface raiders are able to penetrate the Indian Ocean. Lack of shipping has been the most important factor restricting the striking power of the British Middle Eastern armies. To strengthen these armies it seems almost imperative to reopen the Mediterranean sea route. But this can only be achieved by the opening of a western front either in Europe or in French North Africa, which in turn will create vast new demands for ships. In whatever direction Allied strategists turn, the difficulty is always the same—there just are not enough ships.

In the Pacific the crisis is even more severe. It is estimated that Japan has used about 500,000 troops in its conquests of recent months. Pitted against a greatly inferior enemy, its forces were operating in waters relatively close to Japan itself or to well-established Japanese bases. In retaking the ground lost to Japan the United Nations will be confronted with a problem of quite different magnitude. Whether Japan is finally defeated in the East Indies, in China, in Russia, or in Japan proper is immaterial for the purposes of the present discussion. In any case it is obvious that tremendous naval and air forces and powerful expeditionary armies will be required. Considering Japan's great strategic advantages it is conservative to estimate that 2,000,000 well-equipped troops will be needed to destroy its fighting power. These soldiers may come from Australia, India, China, or Russia, as well as from Britain and America, but most of their equipment will have to come from America. Ships will have to make round trips of nearly 20,000 miles while constantly running the risk of destruction by Japanese submarines or surface units. It is no exaggeration to say that the maintenance of supplies to these armies may require more than 2,000 ships. In fact, ultimate shipping requirements in the Pacific will probably exceed those in the Atlantic. Distances across the Pacific are so much greater that it takes two or three ships to transport the same amount of cargo in a year that can be carried by one Atlantic vessel.

The one bright spot in the picture is the tremendous increase of construction in American yards. The present construction program of the Maritime Commission is for 2,900 vessels totaling about 31,000,000 dead-weight tons. This is nearly twice the projected program of the Shipping Board in the last war. And this time ships are actually being completed in time to be of use. Few of the vessels contracted for by the Shipping Board after our entry into the war in 1917 were completed in time to be put in service before the Armistice. Our ship-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

building program aided the Allies only in the sense that they were able to reduce imports below the safety point in 1918 on the assumption that excess tonnage would be available in 1919.

The last three years have witnessed a phenomenal increase in the number of yards and ways available for the construction of merchant shipping. Production has increased from a little more than 100,000 tons a year in 1938 to 700,000 tons a month at the present time. Ships are now being launched at the rate of about two a day, and before the end of this year it is hoped that they will be completed at a rate of three or four a day. On the basis of progress already achieved it seems probable that the program of 786 ships of 8,000,000 tons to be produced this year can be fulfilled. In subsequent years production of 10,000,000 or even 15,000,000 tons of shipping a year can be attained. Ultimately American construction will more than compensate for ship sinkings and create a constantly increasing reservoir of essential shipping for use in the war effort.

But the increased output of American yards can do little to alleviate our shipping shortage this summer and fall. Our military strategists will be plagued with transportation difficulties throughout this critical year. Developments in Europe and Africa may compel the establishment of a western front regardless of risk. By careful planning and rigid rationing of tonnage we *may* find the necessary shipping. We cannot do so, however, without placing serious restrictions on our effort in the Middle East and the Orient.

In brief review, the present Allied tonnage of some 45,000,000 dead-weight tons is just sufficient to furnish essential neutral services, to supply auxiliaries for existing navies, to ferry supplies to Britain, and to maintain relatively small forces in the Middle East and the Orient. Invasion of Western Europe or North Africa with large armies and the maintenance of really strong forces in the Middle East might well require a 50 per cent increase of present tonnage. Any great war effort in the Orient would require another 50 per cent increase. For really adequate conduct of the war the United Nations need two ships for every one they now possess. The hope for victory rests with the American shipbuilding program.

Farmers vs. the Farm Bureau

BY DALE KRAMER

BEHIND the battle in Congress over appropriations for the Farm Security Administration is a struggle which conceivably may change the direction of American agriculture. It has been smoldering for a long time. On the surface it appears to be a difference between the top third of the farmers, who take the cream of agricultural income, and the rest, who divide the blue milk. But the effort of the New Deal to assist the bottom group and the alliance between the spokesmen for the well-to-do farmers and the lobbyists for big business have added far-reaching political implications.

Of immediate importance is the effect that an adequate appropriation for the FSA will have on the Food for Victory program recently outlined by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. The department's chief economist, H. R. Tolley, summed up the situation briefly in testimony before the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-Essential Federal Expenditures, headed by Senator Byrd of Virginia:

> Low-income farmers usually do not have the capital or the credit for machinery or the ability to use labor effectively. They have not used their labor effectively, by and large, in past years, and there is a great reservoir of partly employed farm labor that is going to be, we believe, very needed in 1942 and in 1943, and as long as this [war] keeps on, to produce the food that is needed by the people of our country, by our allies abroad, and by our armed forces.

More specifically, the Farmers' Union, second largest farm organization and the most progressive of the major groups, estimates that in 1943 half a million low-income farmers, if given FSA help, can supply an army of 2,400,000 men with milk, cheese, and eggs for a year, and with potatoes, pork, and butter for six months.

The attack on the FSA by the economy forces in Congress, like that on the CCC and NYA, was anticipated. Many diatribes against assistance to marginal farmers were delivered before the Byrd committee. When Southern politicians learned that FSA clients had enfranchised themselves by paying poll taxes out of their loans, their protests became even more violent. It developed that FSA officials were aware of this use of the loans. As soon as the Southern Senators—Glass of Virginia, McKellar of Tennessee, George of Georgia, and Byrd—had recovered from this shock, they put C. B. Baldwin, FSA administrator, through a sharp cross-examination. Baldwin, supported by Senator La Follette, fought back, justifying the payment of poll taxes out of FSA loans on the ground that it helped to rehabilitate farmers by giving them a feeling of greater responsibility as citizens.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The debate became so acrimonious at one point that Senator Glass threatened to bar Baldwin from Virginia, despite the fact that Virginia is the FSA administrator's home state.

The Senate finally voted the appropriation, though it cut $70,000,000 from the sum requested by the President. The House balked, and in recent weeks liberal farm groups, labor organizations, and religious bodies have been trying to break the deadlock.

From the long-range point of view the most important development of the battle has been the appearance of leaders of the Farm Bureau, the most powerful member of the farm bloc, against the appropriation. The Bureau's president, Edward A. O'Neal, an Alabama planter, not only opposed the FSA but showed his organization's growing animosity toward the New Deal's whole agricultural program, speaking with some bitterness of both ex-Secretary Wallace and Secretary Wickard. On the other hand, representatives of the department placed in the record some facts showing the Bureau's misuse of its government connections. The undercover struggle thus brought partly into the open is the more interesting because the Department of Agriculture created and nourished the Farm Bureau.

During World War I county farm bureaus were established by the department in rural areas to help increase production. County agents distributed literature on scientific farming and gave personal attention to knotty problems. Later home demonstrators advised farm women on better methods of canning, chicken-raising, and the other tasks of the farm wife. Boys and girls were organized in 4-H Clubs which became schools of scientific farming. In time the county farm bureaus were consolidated into state groups, and in 1920 the American Farm Bureau Federation was established as an independent organization. In the years that followed, Republican administrations recognized the advantage of an organization which, as the Farm Bureau's first national president boasted, helped to keep down "unrest" among farmers.

Other government-financed services were tied in. The county agent's office housed the local Farm Bureau; the agent solicited Farm Bureau dues, sent out Farm Bureau letters in franked envelopes, and put Farm Bureau news in the local newspapers under his name. The 4-H Clubs were brought under the auspices of the Farm Bureau, and the government-paid home demonstrator organized her meetings under the Farm Bureau banner. Some state legislatures were induced to grant financial aid; in Iowa, for example, each county must furnish a sum double the total of all Farm Bureau dues. To swell the treasury small-town business men were enlisted as members. Naturally, leaders of other farm organizations found it difficult to compete against such ample funds and were infuriated. The late Milo Reno, a prominent officer of the Farmers' Union and a leader of the farm risings in the latter days of the Hoover Administration, early warned department officials. "You are creating a Frankenstein monster," he said, "and some day it will destroy you."

Certain unsavory operations of the Farm Bureau leaders during the 1920's, revealed in the Muscle Shoals investigation, caused Senator George W. Norris to declare that "the time will come when . . . American farmers will realize by whom they are being deceived," but the department passed over the unpleasantness. In his investigation Norris discovered that Farm Bureau leaders had sold their organization lock, stock, and barrel to the American Cyanamid Company and others who opposed government operation of the fertilizer project—though under government operation farmers would have obtained cheaper fertilizer. Evidence read into the record showed that Farm Bureau officials had also sold their educational facilities—along with the services of the government-paid county agents, home demonstrators, and 4-H Club leaders—to other big-business groups. Among the purchasers were the Asphalt Institute, the National Lumbermen's Association, the Copper and Brass Research Association, and several utilities. Farm Bureau officers made a proposal to the American Shipowners' Association to propagandize for ship subsidies in return for a fee of $94,000, but it was rejected, as was an offer to assist the chain stores. The investigation showed that men posed as Farm Bureau speakers when in reality they were paid representatives of big-business groups, and that propaganda was inserted into so-called educational moving pictures. The smaller government employees and volunteer workers were unaware that they served the selfish ends of national Farm Bureau leaders.

The New Deal agricultural leadership is not entirely without responsibility for the present situation. Early in 1933, after more than three years of depression, disillusioned farmers had left the Farm Bureau by the hundreds of thousands. The AAA gave the organization new life by permitting the tremendous stream of benefit checks to flow partly through the Farm Bureau machinery. The county agent became a more powerful figure in rural areas than ever. In Alabama, O'Neal's home state, blanks were franked out which, when signed by the recipients, authorized the Farm Bureau to deduct dues from the benefit checks. It was government mail and the AAA worksheet was mentioned; the hint could not escape the farmer. An investigation conducted recently by the department, some of the results of which were inserted into the records of the Byrd committee, showed that in the South, particularly in Alabama, government-paid officials still assisted in membership drives, letters of an organizational nature were franked out, and Farm Bureau officers often sat at the side of the government representative who handed out the benefit checks,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to cash the checks and deduct Farm Bureau dues. H. L. Mitchell, general secretary of the Southern Tenant Farmers' Union, in a comprehensive survey revealed that a great many tenants and farm workers are Farm Bureau members without their consent and even without their knowledge, since landlords "set off" their dues from wages and crop shares.

The conflict between the Farm Bureau and the department developed partly because the wealthier commercial farmers who dominate the Bureau have no desire to see their poorer neighbors come into competition with them, partly because these leaders are conservatives who have always worked closely with the large corporations. Whether or not the policy of selling the organization's apparatus directly to interested parties for propaganda purposes has been discontinued is impossible to say, but a new investigation like the one once conducted by Senator Norris should be worth a Senate committee's time. Some of the worst offenders, it is true, have left the Farm Bureau pay roll. But they have gone directly to one or another of the big-business groups they formerly served secretly, and they retain influence in Farm Bureau councils.

The department is finding, like Dr. Frankenstein, that its "monster" has unexpected vitality. In some states statutory action will be necessary to separate the Farm Bureau from the department's extension service. Efforts to enact such legislation by enemies of the Farm Bureau in Minnesota and Iowa have failed. Many of the extension leaders, some holding posts in state agricultural colleges, others protected by civil service, are conservative and want to see the Farm Bureau retain its power. But if the department enforces its rule against the use of government funds or employees in organizational work, the Farm Bureau will suffer greatly.

The chief beneficiary of such a policy is likely to be the Farmers' Union. The Grange, which though generally conservative is opposed to government assistance to the Farm Bureau, will be aided to some extent, but it is less aggressive than the Union. In some states—Wisconsin, the Dakotas, Montana, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and Oklahoma—the Farmers' Union is already more powerful than the Bureau, and it is gaining elsewhere. Its president, James G. Patton of Colorado, is young and aggressive; most of the narrow-minded, breast-beating leaders typical of old farm movements have been shaken out. Patton has established close working relations with the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., and the railroad brotherhoods. The Southern Tenant Farmers' Union has under consideration a plan to join the Farmers' Union in a body. Meanwhile, the Farm Bureau national leadership has suffered an added blow in the defection of the Ohio and Vermont units, whose representatives differed sharply with O'Neal at the FSA hearings. It appears probable—unless John L. Lewis's farm drive proves too disruptive—that a progressive organization which can speak for a majority of the farmers is at last on the way.

Thoughts on "World War III?"

[*In* The Nation *of June 20 J. Alvarez del Vayo raised questions of such importance for the achievement of a democratic victory and a people's peace that the editors asked a number of persons of various nationalities, experts in the field of international relations, to contribute to a discussion of the main points of his article. Some of the comments received were printed last week, others appear below, and the rest will appear in subsequent issues.*]

G. A. BORGESE

Professor of Italian Literature at the University of Chicago and author of "Goliath: The March of Fascism"

I DO not think that the new pact between Russia and Britain or Russia's understanding with the United States offers a basis on which the democratic forces in the United Nations can work toward the establishment of a people's peace in Europe and the world. Needless to say, the agreements of Stalin with the Tory gentlemen are infinitely more palatable than his pact of 1939 with the Nazi gangsters. Russia, however, not only has indorsed the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states—a principle which, as Mr. del Vayo points out, includes the germs of a Metternich peace—but has also, in the treaty with England, insistently separated the European sector from the global war, and, what is worse, admitted the possibility of a period of twenty years or more during which the balance of power should rule the world. Now this is exactly the "cooling-off" period in which the egg would be preserved for the Metternich-Talleyrand peace to hatch.

The heavy pressure, military and political, to which Russia is subjected may explain the deal. It does not make of it the base for a new world.

I do not think that disarmament and the creation of a new League of Nations with broader powers backed by an international police force would be a strong enough alternative to a peace based on the balance of power. I do think that a different and more thoroughgoing system

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of collective security should be substituted for the League.

The form of the new system, whatever the transitional stages may be—though let them be as brief and purposive as possible—should be world federation under a collective supreme power.

I think, with Mr. del Vayo, that only a socialist reconstruction of Europe can provide the basis for a durable peace. I also think that socialism—whatever the temporary and local qualifications of its meaning—is a universal way of life and that a socialist peace in Europe cannot be durable unless Europe is a part of a peaceful and progressively socialist world.

I do not approve of Article 3 of the Atlantic Charter, which makes possible the continued existence of fascist states after the war. Nor do I approve of the clause "with due respect for their existing obligations," which leaves, in Article 4 of the Atlantic Charter, a large loophole for economic imperialism. Nor do I approve of the clause in Article 8 "pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security," which, however involuntarily, includes the germs of the "cooling-off" period and of a Metternich-Talleyrand—or neo-clerico-fascist—New Order.

I do not think that the interests of the people can make themselves felt at the next peace conference, or in the international machinery that already is being set up, through the intervention of the existing political parties or through the creation of new ones, which would have little opportunity for adequate development or for effective intercommunication in the various sectors and continents of the world at war. Nor do I think it desirable, and I hope it can be avoided, that "ultimate control be taken out of the hands of the old-line diplomats" by the explosion of bloody, destructive, and uncoordinated revolutions.

It was clear immediately after Munich that a different way should be attempted. A group of people offered a mode of action which they called "The City of Man." It was described in *The Nation* as a "realistic Utopia." The concept was that a few people, as responsible intellectually as they were free of commitments to established parties and of ambition for direct political power, should examine systematically but promptly the most decisive issues, thus providing the masses with inspiration and the leaders—in so far as they need it—with the content for their leadership.

With that name, or with whatever other name may seem preferable, with that group or another, and with other people—not too many—added to the initial group, I believe more firmly than ever that such an approach is the only way to obtain results in thought and action before it is too late. This is a concrete proposal for the friends of *The Nation* and for Mr. del Vayo to consider. His admirable article should not remain unproductive.

JULIUS DEUTSCH

Former Minister of War of Austria; General in the Spanish Republican army

THE old diplomacy which del Vayo describes so sarcastically cannot rid itself of the old concepts regarding an international order. But we live in an era of upheaval that yearns for new forms. The balance of power, the traditional requisite of diplomacy, would—if it were to be reestablished—be again upset, as always, and this disturbance would lead to new wars. To prevent this the new order in the world must no longer be built upon the sovereign power of individual states but upon the sovereign power of a superstate organization. The individual states would then have less power but more rights. The task we should have to perform would, in this event, not be the establishment of a balance of power, but the securing for each state of as many rights as are essential for its existence and further development—a balance of rights, in short, rather than a balance of power.

Within the limitations of a short article this thought can only be touched upon, but perhaps I shall succeed in making myself understood if I describe in broad outline the international organization of states I have in mind.

The post-war international federation of states should be controlled by an international parliament. Thus there would no longer be career diplomats; in their stead, direct representatives of the people would participate in leading positions. Thus the question whether fascist states should be permitted to take part in an international federation would solve itself. Their participation would in practice be impossible since the exercise of political rights by the citizen is a prerequisite of the international parliament. Whether members of the international parliament should be elected by the citizens of a country or appointed by its national parliament is a question of secondary importance.

An international federation of states without sufficient authority would be still-born, as was the League of Nations after the Versailles treaty. At least the following prerogatives should be considered within the sphere of the federation:

1. International police authority (the armed services).
2. Control of national currencies by a federation bank.
3. International economic regulations (trade and commerce).
4. International control of means of transportation on land, by sea, and in the air.
5. International judiciary.
6. International education.

This enumeration is, of course, not complete; it is merely designed to point to some of the more important possibilities. Once an international superstate has been

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed, the sphere of its authority is bound to develop.

On one point no concessions must be made if future wars are to be averted: policing is the business of the federation; the individual states are and must remain disarmed. A period of transition will of course be unavoidable, for without immediate and complete disarmament of the vanquished dictator states there can be no real peace. Disarmament of the dictator states is a problem that is quite capable of solution—technically as well as politically. Just one example: if these states were deprived of the right to develop aviation—including aviation for commercial and transportation purposes, too—they would have no opportunity to rearm in a field decisive for modern warfare.

It is self-evident that an international order along such lines presupposes a certain homogeneity in the political life of the nations, although it need be by no means uniform. But even far-reaching social assimilations would come to pass more or less swiftly. The states will have to gain control over the vital production centers lest the producers some day set themselves up as masters of the nations' destinies. In other words, to destroy the economic springs of fascism—in Germany, heavy industry and the big landowners—is for democracy no less than a question of life or death.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

Professor of Applied Christianity at Union Theological Seminary

MR. DEL VAYO is quite right in his apprehensions about the hazards we face in establishing a decent peace. Complacency in regard to the war might still cause victory to elude us; and complacency about the possibilities of a durable peace might prove equally disastrous. The democratic forces are on the whole weak and disorganized. Who, for instance, can believe that British labor will be the dominant force in a post-war Britain?

There are, however, some hopeful elements in the situation. It can hardly be denied that Britain has learned the lesson that it cannot maintain order on the Continent merely by manipulating a precarious balance of power between Continental nations. It is probable, though not certain, that we have learned the necessity of participating responsibly in building a community of nations. We may, of course, succumb once more to a psychosis of fear, disillusionment, and withdrawal from the world. But it is not likely. These lessons, which nations learn by bitter experience, are not merely the acquisition of the radical and labor forces. While it is certainly true that a triumph of reaction in the field of domestic politics would seriously imperil creative international arrangements, it is not true that a decent peace depends altogether upon the victory in the domestic struggle of the traditional radical and labor forces. The fact is that an understanding, or lack of it, of what the international situation requires has cut across the traditional party lines in a remarkable way in recent years. I should think that the British political situation offers better hopes for the future than the weakness of the Labor Party would seem to justify.

Mr. del Vayo seems to me to be in error in fearing that the world may revert to the traditional balance-of-power politics. I should regard the peril of a new imperialism as much greater than the danger of an old balance of power. The four great powers—Russia, China, Britain, and America—are bound to dominate the peace in the event of an Axis defeat. The new understanding with Russia increases the chances of war-time arrangements becoming the basis for mutual commitments after the war. There is bound to be some balance of power in a post-war world, in the sense that politics is never freed from the necessity of seeking an equilibrium of social forces. The question is whether the balance of power will be organized or unorganized. I think the prospects are that it will be organized, and that the danger we must guard against will be a too imperialistic organization.

However, the understanding at which we have arrived with Russia is likely to prevent the domination of the post-war world by a purely Anglo-Saxon imperialism, and that is a gain. Mr. del Vayo's excellent analysis does not offer any positive suggestions about the method of world organization. On that task the democratic forces are all equally vague and weak. We know that a balance of power won't do, and we are equally certain that the old League of Nations is inadequate. What shall take its place? Regional and hemispheric federations? World federation? Federation of the democracies only?

Whatever the end toward which we must strive, we must undoubtedly begin with new constitutional commitments by the four great powers, seek to include other powers in these commitments as much as possible, beginning with the other United Nations, and strive and hope for the extension of responsibilities to all nations in time, so that imperialistic corruption of a new world order will be avoided.

OCTAVIO MANGABEIRA

Former Foreign Minister of Brazil

I LIVED in Europe before the war and during the first nine months of the war—until the fall of France. I have the impression that the great mistake of the democracies has been the tolerance, even the goodwill, with which they cooperated in the development of the dictatorships.

It is clear, as the facts have proved, that dictatorship and democracy cannot coexist. One nation is devoted to pacific and civilized activities. Another nation, sometimes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its neighbor, is prepared and educated for fighting. It is not extraordinary if the second nation one day takes advantage of its education and preparation for war to attack the first.

The choice is not between democracy and totalitarianism. The choice is between civilization and crime. Civilization cannot exist where there are not some fundamental liberties, no matter what the name of the political system. On the other hand, there are no effective liberties in the absence of adequate conditions of economic life. Democracy without a social and economic organization corresponding to democratic ideals is not democracy; it is fraud.

Mr. del Vayo is absolutely right when he warns against the methods of the old diplomacy working for the forces which have so injured democratic institutions. Nowadays the only way to secure intervention by the people in the great decisions is to have their real representatives in the government, because only the actions of governments are effective: every day governments become stronger, and every day they draw closer to one another. Therefore the kind of men in power is of the highest importance.

Nobody can defend intervention by one nation in the internal life of another nation. But everybody must recognize that it will be imperative to create an international organization and to endow it with the material force necessary to implement it—otherwise it would be as platonic as the League of Nations. This organization must assure, not the same regime for all peoples, which would be nonsense, but civilization in the world, that is, a minimum of liberty and economic security, the only basis for an enduring peace.

The theory that the people of each nation should choose its form of government is perfect if the people indeed make the choice. But if the form that the government takes is imposed by a tyrant, as history shows it often has been, then application of the theory will result in the consecration of tyranny.

The Atlantic Charter has interpreted the facts and the circumstances of a given historical moment. However, for the world of the future which will arise from the victory of the United Nations there is something to be added to it from some of the speeches of the President of the United States.

The treaty between England and Russia, supplemented by the understandings between the United States and the Soviet Union, offers a wide basis for the reconstruction of the world through the readjustment both of communism and of democracy.

I don't believe in communism because I don't believe in a way of life based on pure materialism. But I do believe that a just and honest socialization, on the basis of real fraternity, is the only means by which democracy can survive and peace endure.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

A Tax on Spending

CONGRESS has done singularly little so far to implement the President's seven-point program for the prevention of inflation. On the one hand, it is hamstringing the Office of Price Administration by cutting down its appropriation and refusing to grant it funds for subsidizing producers squeezed between rising costs and the price ceiling; on the other, it appears to be yielding to the demands of the farm lobby that government-held grain be not released below parity prices. Still worse is the emasculation of the Treasury's tax program at the hands of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Heaven knows Mr. Morgenthau's proposals were over-modest in relation to the vast total of government expenditure scheduled for 1942-43 and to the volume of purchasing power unmatched by goods which is a constant threat to all efforts at price control. But the Ways and Means Committee in its tentative report has lopped $2.8 billion off the Treasury request for an additional $8.7 billion. It has left estate tax rates at present levels and scaled down sharply the income-tax and excise increases suggested by the Treasury. The one significant addition it has proposed is a 5 per cent excise tax on freight transportation, which, since freight is an important item in most costs, is likely to play hob with the whole price-ceiling system.

In easing individual and corporation income taxes the Ways and Means Committee was responding to the pressure of the business lobbies. It turned a deaf ear, however, to the cherished money-raising plan of these same interests—the sales tax. At one time it seemed as if there might be a Congressional majority for this levy, but rumblings from back home convinced many Representatives that it was bad medicine for an election year. Nevertheless, this alleged solution to the fiscal problem is still being assiduously urged by a large part of the press as the only way to tap the pool of war-generated surplus income. We may have been saved from a sales tax this year, but it will inevitably be brought forward again in 1943 unless meanwhile some alternative has been found.

One possibility that is now exciting a good deal of interest in Washington is a tax on spending which would avoid the unfair incidence of the sales tax and at the same time restrict purchasing power to a total corresponding to the volume of goods available. Among the several variations of this proposal is a scheme developed by Jerome Weinstein, a well-known New York tax attorney, who has kindly given me permission to quote from a memorandum he has prepared.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The essence of the Weinstein plan is "a progressive tax on the exercise of purchasing power in excess of a specified exempt amount during the fixed period." Two factors would determine the amount of exempt purchases allowable: the estimated annual expenditure on absolute necessities and the estimated volume of civilian goods available. Probably this amount would be in the neighborhood of $400 annually for each adult, who at intervals of two or three months would be issued a book of coupons entitling him to make purchases up to the face amount of such coupons. In the event that the coupons were exhausted before the end of the period to which they were applicable, extra ones could be obtained on payment of a premium or tax which would be progressively increased in order to act as a deterrent on the exercise of surplus purchasing power. For instance, the tax on extra coupons bought within a year might be 20 per cent on the first $200, 35 per cent on the next $200, and so on; but it would probably prove desirable to impose an absolute limit on the total purchasable by any one person within a fixed period.

Mr. Weinstein does not propose that these coupons should be used in connection with all forms of expenditure but only for goods and services for which potential total demand is likely to exceed potential total supply at ceilinged prices. This would mean primarily food and clothes, while such items as rent, insurance, electricity, and most services would be exempt, at least until such time as labor shortages or other factors made restriction of their consumption desirable. As Mr. Weinstein points out, by rationing spending itself his plan would probably obviate the future necessity of setting up rationing schemes for many individual items. At the same time the scheme is flexible enough to deal with temporary commodity situations. For instance, in the event of a local glut of eggs, the regional administrator of the plan could exempt their purchase from the requirement of coupons for a limited period.

This scheme is only incidentally a revenue measure. Its main object is to achieve a balance between purchasing power and available goods. Considered as a brake on inflation, the plan has considerable advantage over a general sales tax. To quote Mr. Weinstein:

> A general sales tax makes no distinction between the use of minimum essential purchasing power, which should be exempt, and the use of surplus purchasing power. The payment of a general sales tax, the amount of which is necessarily limited by its application to the lowest income groups, cannot effectively restrict purchases by higher income groups, to whom the payment of a 5 per cent sales tax would not be a deterrent. Furthermore, and by reason of its uniform and equal application to all sales, a general sales tax cannot operate progressively as a deterrent on the use of surplus purchasing power.

Considerations of space forbid a detailed exposition of Mr. Weinstein's proposals for effective operation of his scheme. It is not without its administrative difficulties, but I do not think these would be any greater, if as great, as those involved in the collection of a sales tax. In any event the plan is one which deserves public discussion and the closest examination by the tax experts.

In the Wind

MARTIN DIES dined with a friend the other day and pondered over the growing popularity of the Russians in this country. "They're putting up a great fight," he said, "and everybody over here is for them. Maybe the committee had better lay off the Communists and get to work on the Germans."

ONE OF THE MOST intricate of the plans for post-war reconstruction now in circulation was drafted by Ely Culbertson, the bridge expert.

GEORGE SOKOLSKY is ghost-writing many of Thomas E. Dewey's campaign speeches.

JACOB THORKELSON, the first open fascist to be elected to Congress, won in 1938 largely because Senator Wheeler refused to support his own party's candidate. Thorkelson is running again this year, but Wheeler is actively opposing him and backing Wellington Rankin, Jeannette Rankin's brother.

THE REVEREND GERALD WINROD of Kansas, who was running for the United States Senate, has suddenly withdrawn his candidacy. His reasons are not known.

COMPANIES WHICH BROADCAST from army camps or navy stations have in the past refrained from using the prestige of the services for advertising purposes. The policy was breached in a recent broadcast by General Motors from the army air base at Patterson Field in Ohio. The G. M. advertising copy, a letter signed by C. E. Wilson, president of the corporation, was read by the commanding officer at the field.

A RADICAL who in the past has had many run-ins with the government recently registered in the forty-four-to-sixty-five draft group. On the line where he was asked to name someone who would always know where he could be located, he wrote, "the FBI."

AN OFFICIAL of a Norwegian town planned to join the local Quisling organization, and his intentions somehow became known to the people. When he left his house one morning he found a path of evergreen boughs leading from his doorstep to a cemetery nearby.

[*The $5 prize for the best item received in June goes to J. L. of New York for his story about Representative Barry of Queens, published June 13.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

The Bugbear of Pragmatism

THE PRAGMATIC TEST: ESSAYS ON THE HISTORY OF IDEAS. By H. B. Parkes. The Colt Press. $3.

AS WILLIAM JAMES SAID: EXTRACTS FROM THE PUBLISHED WRITINGS OF WILLIAM JAMES. The Vanguard Press. $2.75.

IS THERE a pragmatist under your bed? If you are not too frightened to find out, I think you may discover the person you see whenever you look into a mirror. For pragmatism is very precisely what William James, its reputed inventor, called it: a new name for some old ways of thinking. Nevertheless, pragmatism continues to be the *bête noire* of every critic, poet, and historian whose own mission requires a dragon to make him a St. George. One hero crushes pragmatism under the accusation of materialism; another slays it as Puritan morality in disguise; a third proves that it justifies big business and the swank of success; still others call it a license to believe anything, a low form of cunning, or, worst of all, a fad that started fascism.

This is a William James year, marking as it does the centenary of his birth, and it would be desirable if by means of the many publications the date will call forth the old spook of pragmatic horror could be laid. But this is too much to hope for when even a learned and brilliant critic such as H. B. Parkes sees only half of the whole. He tells us, in a book fittingly called "The Pragmatic Test" and devoted to some of the major figures in our recent intellectual past, that he tests ideas by their working in practice. Ideas presumably affect conduct; conduct has concrete consequences; and therefore concrete consequences enable us to pass one kind of judgment on ideas. Moreover, in the essay on James himself Mr. Parkes clearly sees and clearly says that James's statement of pragmatism is a correct description of scientific procedure. A scientific idea is true when it adequately accounts for the facts, when it "works," not as a plausible explanation merely, but in the working out called proof. For in science no one has yet accused "success" of being contemptible and gross.

But where Mr. Parkes and others, less competent, boggle at pragmatism is in its application to thought in general, to art, ethics, and religion. With seeming finality Mr. Parkes says: ". . . there is a vast difference between proving a scientific theory by making experiments in a laboratory and proving the existence of God by observing the cheerful faces of those who believe in Him." As he puts it, of course, the case is open and shut. We are too familiar with the lure of superstition and self-deception to say anything but "Fie!" when we detect their presence in others. But I think Mr. Parkes conceals an unwarranted assumption in his dramatic contrast; it is the same assumption that made Mr. Van Wyck Brooks assert many years ago that James's taste in art must be crude. It is, indeed, the invariable assumption of anti-pragmatists, and it is this: the belief that the pragmatic test has the same meaning no matter who applies it, no matter what it applies to, and no matter how it is applied. To go back to Mr. Parkes's example, it assumes that under pragmatism if Humphrey Clinker was made cheerful by eighteenth-century Methodism, then Methodism is proved absolutely true for all mankind and all time.

"But," the anti-pragmatist will say, "who then can guarantee the truth of a religion, a moral code, or an aesthetic doctrine?" To which the rejoinder is: Choose your witnesses and do it with care. If St. Thomas is made cheerful by a given creed, he furnishes the very kind of proof we require. And there is no law against being your own St. Thomas if you have the will and the intellectual equipment. But let no one be misled by the word "cheerful," which, if used pragmatically, must imply a real, and not a deceptive, satisfaction. A fastidious pragmatist will not be cheerful in this sense until the most exacting demands of logic, consistency, and beauty, which *are* practicality, have been fulfilled. The higher and more complex the demands you make upon a truth, the more pragmatic your behavior. If this implies relativism, as it does, it is a guaranty that no limited or inferred truth will be palmed off as all inclusive. In some matters, as Pascal pointed out, man must take a chance, he is "embarked." To which the pragmatist adds, "I have no confidence in certainty."

But that is not all. The anti-pragmatist carps also at the origin supposedly assigned to ideas by the pragmatic philosopher. The "anti" says that something he calls mind or reason, and holds to be independent of another entity called will, is the true source of true ideas. Unless it is so, he maintains, the contemplative life has no meaning but merges with the practical life. Yet all good things, he is sure, come from "disinterested" motives. Of course! This part of the argument rests on a quibble: disinterested does not mean *un*interested. Commonplaces mislead us: when we say we listen to music "for its own sake" we mean no such thing. We listen to music for our own sake; but this again can mean two things. It can mean that we are looking for some clear external benefit, as when we trade on our musical knowledge in order to feel superior or to teach the violin, and it can also mean an imponderable inward benefit: we listen to music because we like it. The contemplative life, in other words, is good not in the air but good for us. Now, whether we have a *will* to achieve it or simply have a *mind* to is a matter of wording. To detach mind from will, idea from feeling, "benefit" from "contemplation" is to make an abstract distinction of very limited value. It becomes one of unlimited danger when it leads the anti-pragmatist to assert that we do things not for the satisfaction of our interests or the fulfilment of our ideals but for the thing itself and the ideal itself.

The causes of this long misunderstanding of James are deeply rooted in our linguistic habits no less than in our moral poses. But a more remediable cause lies in the rigid way intellectual history is written. Mr. Parkes frequently avoids this fault, but just as frequently falls into it, particularly in his earlier essays, where he describes by means of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

single notions such complex events as Puritanism or Emerson's thought, or Jonathan Edwards's career. The practice involves a reduction, and a reduction which generally takes the form: "X's whole life amounts only to the error Q." One would like to know in virtue of what finally established truth every previous thinker has "failed" or sacrificed his soul to error. It is easy to match modern "confusion" with the simplicity of truisms like Aristotle's "the good man is the standard of good and evil," but this is hardly more than the old trick of comparing a chaotic present with an artificially tidied-up past.

A second historical mistake consists in lumping together James, Dewey, and Bergson as "the anti-intellectualists." The cases are separate. James must be studied by himself, and, needless to say, the place to study him is in his own text. Mr. Parkes, I feel sure, has been as careful with James as with all the other subjects of his essays, but I am astonished to find him citing the "Psychology" as quintessential James. That work is not a plateau but a crest dividing two doctrines—the scientific materialism of its period and James's rejection of it. And the final chapter on Necessary Truths refutes most of the stock arguments against the later "Pragmatism."

As an introduction to the James canon, Elizabeth Perkins Aldrich has edited a varied and entertaining collection of sayings grouped by subject and attractively printed. The volume is made still more valuable by the addition of a dozen hitherto unpublished drawings by James himself. In these pages, and with slight effort, the general reader can get a truer notion of the man and his thought than can be found in the professionals' handbooks. The variety and depth of his perceptions, the fineness of his moral and aesthetic fiber, the subtlety of his mind, and the elasticity of his prose will, it is hoped, blot out the fantastic but common image of an inartistic but powerful Yankee thinker, a philosophical P. T. Barnum, who might have come to some good if he had been born outside America and received "proper training."

As to the ultimate value of James's thought, if anyone must do less than judge for himself on the basis of the written word, he had better rely on Professor Whitehead, who said that James, like Descartes, was the founder of a new philosophical epoch. JACQUES BARZUN

Mr. Hoover on Peace

THE PROBLEMS OF LASTING PEACE. By Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson. Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.

A BOOK on the problems of peace and reconstruction by a former President and his chief confidant on international affairs might well be, as the publishers claim this book is, "a lasting landmark in the literature" on that subject. It might be, but it isn't.

The two authors have had some valuable experience, and they point to it again and again as the source of their wisdom. But experience alone does not generate wisdom. In this case the wisdom is compounded of experience and dogma, and in consequence it is not very illuminating. The dogma which informs the book is that of classical liberalism; the authors apply it rigorously to domestic politics and, with some lapses into inconsistency, to international affairs. When they use the term the "fifth freedom," they mean, they say, the right "to engage in enterprise so long as each does not injure his fellow-man. And that requires law to prevent abuses." They seem to think that their willingness to grant the necessity of law to prevent abuses prevents their system from being "laissez faire or capitalistic exploitation." At any rate the fear of government control dominates their thought. According to them, "the attempt by Blum to mix larger doses of totalitarian economics into free economy contributed to the demoralization of the country." Of the United States they say that, "impatient with recovery from world depression by the hard way, it became infected with managed economy in 1933." This statement occurs in a historical analysis, and the authors generously forgo further consideration of our plight under the New Deal with the remark that "whether managed economy in the United States had extended over the line where recovery by voluntary and cooperative action of free enterprise was stifled and liberty infringed is not a part of this discussion."

Applying their laissez faire doctrines to international affairs, they would outlaw "governmental buying and selling, unstable currencies, special agreements such as reciprocal and preferential agreements, quotas, monopolies, cartels, and tariffs." They believe that "if there is to be a restoration of a real volume of international trade, there must be assurance of ultimate removal of all government buying and selling in foreign markets, except for possible storage of raw materials for international stabilization." They would stabilize currency by returning to "gold convertibility," which has been the "world's solution for 6,000 years."

Their whole plan for world peace is characterized on the one hand by a rigorous adherence to classical liberal doctrine in international as well as in domestic affairs and on the other by rather obvious and inconsistent departures from their principles. One departure is prompted by old-fashioned Republican prejudices. Having included tariffs among the hindrances to world peace, they recant their consistency, observing that "tariffs have occupied an exaggerated importance in public discussion," that "they are, through centuries of universal use, deeply imbedded in the economy of nations," and that they must therefore be dealt with more gently than other barriers.

Most of their other departures from their formula are prompted by the fact that they know too much about the necessities of international relations to be able to maintain their thesis without deviation. Thus though they have outlawed government buying and selling, they conclude "that the governments of the world must bear the burden of shipping, credit, and the distribution of supplies. And they will have to bear these burdens for the enemy as well as for liberated countries." Presumably this kind of government action is to be confined to a very brief period after the war.

It is not easy to say how far the authors depart from their fear of government control when they envisage plans of world organization. For when they come to that problem they adopt the method of an impartial presentation of the various plans of organization without committing them-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves to any, though they do say that "some organization of force methods to preserve peace will be necessary for some years to come." They are inclined to believe that "the victorious powers will, with military means, jointly dominate the world for so long as their interests do not clash. They will need to do so at least during a period for political and economic recuperation." Thus a program for a "lasting peace" envisages no more than joint military domination by the victorious powers "so long as their interests do not clash." This illuminating conclusion illustrates the difficulties encountered by two confused authors who are driven in one direction by their experience and in another by the resolutely held dogma that "the least possible government is the best possible government."

It ought to be mentioned that Hoover and Gibson are on the side of the angels when dealing with the problem of a vanquished foe. They believe that "there can be no lasting peace in Europe with a dismembered Germany," and they have some very sane advice on the necessity of relieving distress in the defeated countries as soon as the war is over. They abhor post-war blockades.

The first half of the book analyzes the history of past centuries as a preliminary to the presentation of positive proposals for peace in the second half and is a curiously textbookish production. Seven forces in world affairs are isolated and listed as follows: (1) ideologies, (2) economic pressures, (3) nationalism, (4) militarism, (5) imperialism, (6) the complex of fear, hate, and revenge, (7) the will to peace. In analyzing recent epochs of Western history, the authors ask how each of these forces acted in each particular period. It is all rather artificial and not very illuminating. One is reminded of school pageants of years ago in which various symbolic characters appeared in turn with no more dialogue than the announcement, "I am the spirit of hate" or "I am the spirit of good-will." Such pageants had about the same relation to real drama as these abstractions have to history.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

The Free French in Africa

MIRACLE ON THE CONGO: REPORT FROM THE FREE FRENCH FRONT. By Ben Lucien Burman. The John Day Company. $1.75.

BEN BURMAN didn't believe Pétain was France. Away out in Hollywood he kept hearing about Vichy, Montoire, and collaboration till he had had enough. A quiet man, still shaken from wounds received at Soissons, he wanted a gun and a chance to fight for the real France. The Free French persuaded him to take a typewriter instead.

Mr. Burman discovered Free French Africa for the American press. His news dispatches and magazine pieces put a spotlight on the dark jungle where France was being reborn. Home again after nine months spent between Brazzaville and Beirut, he rounded up and trimmed his African stories into this book. The result is an honest, loyal testament to the brave men who have transformed the black continent into a fortress for the democracies. In its compact, lucid analysis of the factors which led to the Bordeaux armistice, its indictment and proof of Vichy villainy, its catalogue of Free French contributions to Allied victory, and its assault on the injustice of non-recognition, "Miracle on the Congo" strikes a hard blow for a cause which deserves more friends.

There are some faults of style and a few dubious opinions. Too many pages, packed with tom-toms, crocodiles, and tropical mystery, read like a Grade B scenario. Trustworthy observers returning from France do not confirm the assertion, unfortunately, that De Gaulle has 80 to 95 per cent of the French people behind him. Nor is every man in the Free French movement as pure and white a knight as we are asked to believe. Hangers-on and opportunists have afflicted every creed in history, and it is no slur on the Cross of Lorraine to note their presence here too. But these are errors of enthusiasm. The book, in the main, is good and true.

Congo fact puts Mississippi fiction in the shade. The author of "Steamboat Round the Bend" and "Blow for a Landing" left off novel-writing to explore a land where quinine is "a sort of hors d'œuvre" and terrible armies of man-eating red ants march like Prussians in mile-long parade. In Brazzaville he interviewed General de Gaulle and learned that Pétain's first words upon joining the Reynaud government, almost a month before the end, were, "We must capitulate." He voyaged north through equatorial forests and desert wastes to lonely Free French outposts in the Chad where camel patrols stood guard against Axis Libya. In Syria he beat the Allied forces of occupation into Beirut, traveling by car over the mine-strewn Damascus road, after watching Free and Vichy Frenchmen die in fratricidal battle. In burning Transjordan his host was the legendary Glubb

An Important New Book by

Carl J. Friedrich

Professor of Government, Harvard University

THE NEW BELIEF IN THE COMMON MAN

For the world now in birth, Dr. Friedrich has created a new faith founded upon a realistic view of the common man's capacity for self-government. A masterly vindication of the democratic idea. $3.00

LITTLE, BROWN & CO., BOSTON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pacha—Major John Bagot Glubb of Pembury Village in Kent—a new, pocket-sized Lawrence who has recruited the wild Bedouins into a disciplined, democratic Arab Legion.

Despite the drama of his later adventures east of Suez, the best of Mr. Burman's story is in the opening chapters, which give the book its name. In Equatorial Africa he saw a nation go back to war. This was the miracle—that men who refused to accept the defeat of France were able, in the deadly heat, disease, and desolation of the Congo, to reconstruct an army and reclaim a territory four times as large as their fallen homeland 4,000 miles away.

HAL LEHRMAN

RESORTS

In the Heart of The Adirondacks
SCAROON MANOR
HOTEL on SCHROON LAKE, N.Y.
9 HOLE GOLF COURSE ON PREMISES
9 Clay Tennis Courts
8 Handball Courts
Complete Social & Sport Staffs
Earl Carpenter & His Orchestra

QUISISANA CAMPS

At Center Lovell, In Maine's Pine Woods in the White Mountain Region
SITUATED ON LAKE KEZAR, The Most Beautiful Lake in U. S. A.
QUAINT • RESTFUL • ROMANTIC

Cheerful individual cottages with bath, fireplaces, electricity. Main Lodge rooms with or without private bath. Food of highest quality, wholesome, tempting. Golf, tennis, boating, swimming, natural sand beach. Excellent fishing; Salmon, Black Bass. No car is necessary to come to Quisisana Camps. Convenient train or bus transportation. We meet all trains and buses. Non-Sectarian. Ownership-Management.

Weekly Rates from $38 American Plan — Lower Rates during June to July 15

WRITE FOR BOOKLET QUISISANA CAMPS, CENTER LOVELL, MAINE

AMUSEMENTS

CHERYL CRAWFORD presents
George Gershwin and DuBose Heyward's
PORGY AND BESS

"Go see 'Porgy and Bess' if you go see nothing else."
—Kronenberger, PM

PRICES:
Evgs. . . . $2.75 to 55¢
Mats. . . . $2.20 to 55¢

Air-Cooled MAJESTIC THEA., W. 44 St. Eves. Incl., Sun. Mats. Wed. & Sat.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

THE NATION 55 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

For the inclosed $..... please enter my subscription for the period indicated below:

☐ THIRTEEN WEEKS ($1) ☐ TWO YEARS ($8)
☐ ONE YEAR ($5) ☐ THREE YEARS ($11)

Name.....

Address.....

City.....

Extra Postage for Year: Canadian, 50c; Foreign, $1.00 7-11-42

Lafayette

LAFAYETTE AND THE CLOSE OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. By Louis Gottschalk. The University of Chicago Press. $4.50.

PROFESSOR GOTTSCHALK is without doubt an authority of distinction on all matters concerning the Marquis de Lafayette. It is entirely probable that he knows more of the doings, correspondence, friendships, hatreds, philanderings, gaieties, and sorrows of the sprightly French nobleman than anyone else now living. He looks upon a fact concerning Lafayette, however little it may be, with the reverence that an inveterate stamp collector gives to a Mauritius blue of 1785. Dr. Gottschalk's present work, "Lafayette and the Close of the American Revolution," is a literary stamp collection built up around the gallant Marquis and his activities in America on his second visit, from April, 1780, to January, 1782. The book has 458 pages and 1,551 footnotes. The author never leaves his readers in doubt as to the source of his information. His work is as free from vagaries and flights of the imagination as a report of the New York Stock Exchange.

In remarking that the learned professor's book resembles a stamp collection the present reviewer does not intend, even by implication or innuendo, to discredit its value. On the contrary, this book—and those of Professor Gottschalk's that preceded it—are all valuable contributions to historical literature. Without such scholarly works as a source of reference an author who is writing history for the average reader would have immense difficulty in getting his facts together.

The volume under review is the third of a series on Lafayette. The preceding volumes are "Lafayette Comes to America" and "Lafayette Joins the American Army." As the present book ends at the close of the American Revolution, and Lafayette lived until 1834, Dr. Gottschalk must intend to write two or three more volumes.

The author brings out clearly the ardent affection that existed between Washington and Lafayette. The former was childless and Lafayette, when a boy, had lost his father, who was killed in battle. He wrote to Washington, "There never was a friend, my dear general, so much, so tenderly beloved as I do love and respect you." And Washington said to La Luzerne, the French ambassador, "I do not know a nobler, finer soul, and I love him as my own son."

This book is clearly not intended for popular reading. It is confusing, here and there, because of the piling up of unnecessary facts and the failure of the author to distinguish between great and small events. He is completely lacking in the sense of drama. One of the most startling events of the American Revolution was Benedict Arnold's treason; Dr. Gottschalk has managed, by some miracle of writing, to squeeze all the excitement out of it.

This reviewer does not hesitate to predict that when the Lafayette series is completed Dr. Gottschalk will be the recipient of a Pulitzer prize, though we may be sure that he is not writing with that reward in mind. W. E. WOODWARD

[*Coming soon: "American Primitive Painting," by Jean Lipman—reviewed by Clement Greenberg.*]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MUSIC

THE Ballet Russe de Monte Carlo has appeared recently at the Metropolitan, at the Stadium, and in films of "Capriccio espagnol" and "Gaité parisienne" at the Fifth Avenue Playhouse.

The film has its elements and procedures; and so has the ballet. In the ballet you see the entire human figure; you see the movement of this figure in a frame of space; and you see this movement continuously. You see the movement of the entire figure in a frame of space because that is what the ballet is concerned with; you see it continuously because the continuity of the progression of movement in one of the scenes of "Capriccio espagnol" is essential to its effect. As against this visual continuity the film achieves narrative continuity, by means—the shifts from one place or action to another, from long shot to close-up, and so on—that produce visual discontinuities. Filming a ballet, then, means combining these different objectives and different techniques; it means producing what at certain times is a motion picture with narrative continuity and at other times a picture of ballet movement with visual continuity. In the case of "Capriccio espagnol" it should have meant letting the camera move from place to place, action to action, long shot to close-up, for the motion picture narrative that takes us to the point where a dance-scene begins, and then holding the camera continuously pointed at this scene (though not necessarily motionless while so pointed). Instead, in the actual film of this ballet, the devices of the narrative are carried into the dance-scene: the camera jumps from the dance to the spectators, from one dancer to another, from one type of shot to another, destroying the visual continuity of the scene. Not only are the dance-scenes—all except Massine's—chopped up into bits in this way, but the dancers' figures are poorly presented in their frames of space: groups clutter the scene; leaping and whirling solo dancers are framed too closely. In addition there are moments when a close-up presents not the entire figure but only part of it. And there are other losses: on the stage Massine's entrance for the final scene of "Capriccio espagnol" is electrifying; on the screen—what with the commentator's voice that blankets the sound of his heels, and the crowd that screens his movements—there is no entrance.

The company in the films is the one that appeared at the Metropolitan last fall—with Danilova (who is hardly seen), Toumanova, Massine, Youskevitch, Eglevsky, and Franklin. It returned in the spring weakened by the departure of Toumanova and Eglevsky, the temporary absence of Danilova with an injured foot; and the losses were not made up by the return of Slavenska, whose dancing is an exhibition of pure, cold technical skill without the slightest overtone of poetry, style, or grace. This was important because the company has nothing but its few star dancers; and with the corps de ballet poor in quality and insufficiently rehearsed a piece like the first scene of Balanchine's "Serenade," with its wonderful ensemble patterns, is reduced to confusion and ruin by the smudging of the lines and group movements that must be clean and sharp, and other performances are no more than the moments when the stars are on the stage—including certain great moments like those of Massine's entrance in "Capriccio espagnol," his dancing here and in "Beau Danube," the dancing of Danilova and Franklin in "Gaité parisienne." But with all the departures and shifts in roles even these moments were fewer. One change was interesting: Youskevitch in place of Massine in "Beau Danube," making handsome appearance and youthful technical brilliance do for the older man's compelling presence and brilliance of style. The other changes, however, gave us Slavenska and Zoritch in place of Danilova and Franklin in "Gaité parisienne," Slavenska in place of Danilova in "Beau Danube," Zoritch in place of Youskevitch in "Afternoon of a Faun."

At the Stadium Danilova was back in "Gaité parisienne," but without Franklin; and she and Massine were in "Beau Danube," but with an otherwise undistinguished cast that made one think back to the first performances of the piece in 1934, and curse the human weaknesses that had broken up the brilliant company which included Massine, Woizikovsky, Shabelevsky, Lichine, Danilova, Toumanova, Riabouchinska, Baronova. The inadequacies of the Stadium stage conditions exacted their price in artistic effectiveness; and there was a further loss of communicative effect in the vast uncontained space of the open-air theater. Moreover, the music was badly performed and was distorted by the electrical amplification.

At the Metropolitan I saw my first performances of "St. Francis," which I had read was Massine's supreme creative achievement, but which confirmed the impression I had got from previous serious ballets of Massine—that his gift in choreography is for gaiety and fun and wit; though "Saratoga" provided evidence that he can fail even in these. Hindemith's music, for "St. Francis," which also had been spoken of as outstanding, I did not find different from the rest of his dry and sour output; Weinberger's for "Saratoga," on the other hand, turned out to be as it had been described: terrible.

B. H. HAGGIN

CONTRIBUTORS

PAUL MAXWELL ZEIS, assistant professor of political science at the University of Akron, is the author of "American Shipping Policy," the standard book dealing with government aid for the merchant marine.

DALE KRAMER has spent many years studying conditions among farmers. He has contributed to *Harper's*, the *Survey Graphic*, and other magazines.

JACQUES BARZUN, assistant professor of history at Columbia, is the author of "Darwin, Marx, Wagner."

HAL LEHRMAN is an American newspaperman who has lived and worked in France.

W. E. WOODWARD is the author of "George Washington," "A New American History," and "Lafayette."

BOOK BARGAINS

Balance Sheet of the Future: Ernest Bevin....$ .50
Bulwark of the Republic: B. J. Hendrick ($8 ed.) .50
Meaning of Culture: John Cowper Powys..... .50
The Airmen: Selden Rodman (orig. $2 ed.).... .50
Success: Lion Feuchtwanger (orig. $3 ed.)..... .50
The Pretender: Lion Feuchtwanger (Viking ed.) .50
Europe in the Spring: Clare Boothe ($2.50 ed.).. .50
A Prairie Grove: Donald C. Peattie..... .50
Brief Hour of Francois Villon: John Erskine.... .50
The Harsh Voice: Rebecca West..... .50
The Thinking Reed: Rebecca West..... .50
Muirhead's BLUE GUIDES, $3, $4, $5, $6 list: French Alps; Southern Spain & Portugal; Normandy; 70 Miles Around London (Macmillan) each .50
Stedman's Complete Pocket Guide to Europe... .50
Battle for Asia: Edgar Snow..... .85
Owen Glendower: J. C. Powys ($5-2 vol. ed.) 1.00
Moment in Peking: Lin Yutang (orig. $8 ed.).. 1.25
The Old Bunch: Meyer Levin..... 1.35
The Golden Bough: Sir James Frazer ($1.98 list) 1.50
Out of the Night: Jan Valtin ($3.50 ed.)..... 1.50
Mein Kampf: Hitler (Reynal & Hitchcock)..... 1.65
The Mind and Society: Vilfredo Pareto..... (the orig. 4 vol. Harcourt Brace $20 set, new) 9.00
Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences: Editors Seligman & Johnson, new, $45 reg., 8 vol. ...32.50
Add 10¢ per book U. S. mailing on orders under $2
DOWNTOWN BOOK BAZAAR, 212 B'way, N. Y. C.

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISING RATES
62 cents a line (6 words)
Minimum 3 lines
THE NATION
55 Fifth Avenue New York City
Telephone, ALg. 4-3311

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

A Partisan of the King

Dear Sirs: Leigh White's article in your issue of June 13 in which he attempts to answer the question "Whom does the Greek King represent?" is bristling with historical errors and unfounded conclusions. It appears that the author has not drawn his facts from a study of political events in Greece but has gleaned them from gossip by partisan Greek fugitives from embattled Greece, men who have come to the United States carrying their Greek or English wealth and now aspire to grasp the leadership of the Greek nation.

King George II of Greece has not come to the United States, as Mr. White claims, to bolster his throne. The Atlantic Charter declares that the policy of the United States and Great Britain —and now Russia's is the same—will be not to interfere with a nation's internal affairs. The Greeks, therefore, like all other independent nations, will decide on the form of government they want by themselves, without any outside help. King George and Premier Tsouderos risked a perilous voyage to America solely for the purpose of obtaining armaments to enable the Greek forces in Libya and Palestine and the Greek navy in the Mediterranean to keep up the fight.

Is King George hated by the Greek people? Let us look at the record, as Governor Smith used to say. When the King fled from Greece at the approach of the German invaders, he did not fly to Egypt or to Turkey or to the United States, as many of his enemies have done. He fled to the island of Crete, with his Cretan Premier, Tsouderos. Yes, to Crete, the homeland of Venizelos and Tsouderos, the hotbed of Greek anti-monarchism and radical republicanism. And the Greeks of Crete risked their own lives to save King George from the Stukas that were pursuing him. And what about the 75,000 Greek soldiers in the Near East who are fighting for democracy? Did they also resent the King's leadership? Have the Greek sailors rebelled against the King and Admiral Sakellariou? The answer of course is no.

Now a word about Admiral Sakellariou, whose appointment as Secretary of the Navy appears to Mr. White to prove conclusively that King George is a fascist. Admiral Sakellariou is one of the outstanding officers in the Greek navy. Under Metaxas he was merely naval chief of staff and did not receive a political appointment until Mr. Tsouderos, the avowed friend of democracy, appointed him to the Cabinet with the consent of the King. He has never participated in any political activities in Greece; nor did he take part in any of the many revolutions in his country. In fact, when he presided over the court martial which tried the Republican leaders of the abortive Venizelist revolution in 1935, the Greek nation had a unique opportunity to judge the fairness and generosity of Admiral Sakellariou, who urged the military prosecutors to refrain from meddling in the purely political affairs of the country and reminded them that it was their duty to serve the country as soldiers under any Greek administration. It is true that Admiral Sakellariou has always been loyal to the King, but he has never been personally loyal to Metaxas and his regime.

The Greeks are fighting against the enemies of America. King George and Premier Tsouderos and Admiral Sakellariou are leading the Greeks in that fight. And that is of paramount importance to America. When actions talk so loud, words and gossip serve merely to discourage our real friends. The American people should frown on such defeatist gossip.

N. J. CASSAVETES

New York, June 26

Mr. White Bolsters His Thesis

Dear Sirs: Mr. Cassavetes accuses me of writing an article "bristling with historical errors" but neglects to point out a single one. I must assume therefore that he takes exception only to my conclusions. Specifically, he disagrees with three: (1) that Admiral Sakellariou is a fascist; (2) that King George is extremely unpopular in Greece; and (3) that the King's motive in visiting the United States is to bolster his highly doubtful claims to a legally non-existent throne.

Has Mr. Cassavetes forgotten Sakellariou's famous strictures against popular government? "You've got to use a whip over the people" is one often quoted. "Democracy is the worst possible form of government" is another. Mr. Cassavetes may not attach much importance to such utterances, but I do, and I think the majority of the Greek people do—especially since the author was one of the prime instigators of the Kondyles dictatorship, a leader of the bloody counter-revolution against the Venizelist liberals in 1935, and the Metaxist chief of staff who removed almost every democratically-minded officer from the roster of the Greek navy.

As for King George's popularity, that can be finally determined only by means of an honest plebiscite after the war is won. To date King George has not been willing to submit himself to such a test. I realized his unpopularity after talking to large numbers of Greeks in Salonika, Athens, Patras, and Corfu between March and September, 1941. I can assure Mr. Cassavetes that a great wave of revulsion swept the country after the King escaped, and that the Greeks with whom I talked were almost unanimous in their denunciation of him.

Rightly or wrongly, they were convinced that King George as well as Metaxas was responsible for the sordid misappropriation of the aircraft funds that had been collected by direct taxation and for the appointment of such traitorous generals as Pappadimas and Tsolakoglou. They also blamed the King for the treasonable series of intrigues by which a large part of the Greek army was demobilized against its will before the final surrender to the Germans, and as a result of which Prime Minister Korizis committed suicide.

I heartily agree with Mr. Cassavetes that the Greek people should be permitted to decide for and by themselves the post-war government of Greece. That is precisely why I wrote my article. I was afraid—and I am still afraid—that King George and his camarilla will try to decide it for them. The Greeks deserve a better fate than that.

LEIGH WHITE

Lincoln, Neb., July 2

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, $1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED